

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address Commissioners of Patent's AND TRADEMARKS was objected with the Commission of the Commis

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09.627,979	07/28/2000	Randy H. Y. Lo	UPA-00156	3057
75	03 14 2003			
Jason Z Lin			EXAMINER	
19597 Via Monte Drive Saratoga, GA 95070			NGUYEN, DILINH P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2814	

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	,				
	•	09/627.979	LO ET AL.	J.				
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit					
		DiLinh Nguyen	2814					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication a		with the correspondence add	ress				
Period fo	• •		MONTHONEDOM					
THE I - Externafter - If the - If NO - Failu - Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days a reperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stated the period by the Office later than three months after the mailed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1 704(b).	J. 136(a) In no event, however, may eply within the statutory minimum of od will apply and will expire SIX (6) N tute, cause the application to become	y a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered timely MONTHS from the mailing date of this cone e ABANDONED (35 U S C § 133)	nmunication				
1)[Responsive to communication(s) filed on $\underline{0}$	8 January 2002						
2a)⊡	This action is FINAL . 2b)	This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allo closed in accordance with the practice under	wance except for formal i er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935	matters, prosecution as to the C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	merits is				
•	ion of Claims	ding in the application						
4)[4) Claim(s) 41-45,47-54,56 and 57 is/are pending in the application.							
د، ا	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
/	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
	Claim(s) <u>41-45,47-54,56 and 57</u> is/are rejected.							
•	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
	ion Papers	a/or election requirement.						
• •	The specification is objected to by the Exami	iner.						
, —	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) _ ac		by the Examiner.					
,0,	Applicant may not request that any objection to							
11)	11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.							
,	If approved, corrected drawings are required in							
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.								
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	eign priority under 35 U.S	.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a	□ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:							
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
*	3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International See the attached detailed Office action for a	Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a	3)).	Stage				
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome			application).				
	 a) The translation of the foreign language Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dom 	provisional application ha	as been received.					
Attachme		•						
1) Mot	ice of References Cited (PTO-892) ice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) irmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(5) Notic	view Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(se of Informal Patent Application (PTG r					

Art Unit: 2814

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 50 is objected to because of the following informalities:

The phrase: "...said bare chip is bonded to said substrate..." should be changed to "...said bare chip is bonded to said multi-chip module substrate...".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 41-45 and 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin (U.S. Pat. 6301121) and Akram et al. (U.S. Pat. 5994166) in view of Rostoker et al. (U.S. Pat. 5648661).

Lin discloses a multi-chip module package structure (fig. 1A, column 1, lines 33 et seg.) comprising:

a multi-chip module substrate;

at least two chip packages, each of the chip packages being a packaged chip module having a bare chip a chip substrate packaged and enclosed therein;

a plurality of electrical connect points electrically connecting the chip packages with the multi-chip module substrate.

Art Unit: 2814

Lin fails to disclose the chip packages having been burn-in tested and function tested; a plurality of electrical connect pins; and a package material enclosing the multi-chip module substrate, the connect points and the chip packages.

Akram et al. disclose a semiconductor device (cover fig.) comprising: a plurality of electrical connect pins 114 (column 5, line 64);

a package material 172 (column 6, line 26) enclosing a multi-chip module substrate 102, a connect points 126 and a chip packages to achieve densely packaged semiconductor device (abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Lin to achieve densely packaged semiconductor device, as shown by Akram et al.

Lin and Akram et al. fail to disclose the chip packages having been burn-in tested and function tested.

Rostoker et al. disclose a plurality of dice 102 have passed both burned- in and function tests (figs. 2A-3A, column 8, lines 45-58 and column 30, lines 31-37) to detect chips that are defective at wafer level and reduce the cost for the semiconductor device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Lin and Akram et al. to detect chips that are defective at wafer level by burn in tested, function tested and reduce the cost for the semiconductor package device, as shown by Rostoker et al.

 Regarding claim 42, Lin discloses the chip package is a chip scale package (column 1, lines 33-34).

Art Unit: 2814

 Regarding claim 43. Lin discloses at least one of the chip packages is a chip scale package with wire bonding.

- Regarding claim 44, Akram et al. disclose a chip 162 is a chip scale package with flip chip bonding (column 6, lines 44-48).
- Regarding claim 45, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to form one of the chip packages is a central pad bonding package.
- Regarding claim 47, Akram et al. disclose the plurality of electrical connect pins are solder balls.
- Regarding claim 48, Lin discloses the plurality of electrical connect points are solder balls.
- 3. Claims 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanioka (U.S. Pat. 5784264) in view of Rostoker et al. (U.S. Pat. 5648661).

Tanioka discloses a multi-chip module package structure (fig. 1, column 1, lines 39 et seq.) comprising:

a multichip module substrate 10 (column 1, line 41);

at least a bare chip 7;

at least one chip package being a packaged chip module having a bare chip 2 and a chip substrate packaged 11 and enclosed therein;

a plurality of electrical connect points electrically connecting the bare chip and at least one chip package with the multi chip module substrate;

a plurality of electrical connect pins 14; and

Art Unit: 2814

a package material 16 enclosing the chip module substrate, the connect points, the bare chip and at least one chip package.

Tanioka fails to disclose at least one chip package having been burn in tested and function tested.

Rostoker et al. disclose a plurality of dice 102 have passed both burned- in and function tests (figs. 2A-3A, column 8, lines 45-58 and column 30, lines 31-37) to detect chips that are defective at wafer level and reduce the cost for the semiconductor device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Tanioka to detect chips that are defective at wafer level by burn in tested, function tested and reduce the cost for the semiconductor package device, as shown by Rostoker et al.

- Regarding claim 50, Tanioka discloses the bare chip 7 is bonded to the substrate by wire bonding.
- Regarding claim 51, Tanioka discloses at least one chip package is a chip scale package or a wafer level chip scale package.
- Regarding claim 52, Tanioka discloses at least one chip package is chip scale package with wire bonding.
- Regarding claims 53-54, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill
 in the art to form one of the chip packages is a chip scale package with flip chip
 bonding or central pad bonding.
- Regarding claim 56, Tanioka discloses the plurality of electrical connect pins are solder balls 14.

Art Unit: 2814

 Regarding claim 57, Tanioka discloses the plurality of electrical connect points are wires.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 41and 49 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Therefore, please see the new grounds of rejection above.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DiLinh Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-6983. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 6:00PM (M-F).

Art Unit: 2814

Page 7

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael Fahmy can be reached on (703) 308-4918. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

DLN March 6, 2003

ξ.